
Appeal Decision

Site visit made on 15 February 2017

by Michael Moffoot DipTP MRTPI DipMgt MCMI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government

Decision date: 28th February 2017

Appeal Ref: APP/T5150/D/16/3163870

126 Maybank Avenue, Wembley HA0 2TE

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr E Vata against the decision of the Council of the London Borough of Brent.
 - The application Ref: 16/3741, dated 24 August 2016, was refused by notice dated 18 October 2016.
 - The development proposed is 'demolition of existing garage and erection of a two storey side extension to dwellinghouse. Alterations to frontage including widening of existing vehicle crossover and addition of soft landscaping'.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matter

2. The Council advises that since the determination of the proposal at appeal the Unitary Development Plan¹ has been superseded by the Local Plan². Accordingly, those UDP policies cited in the decision notice have been superseded by Policy DMP1 of the Local Plan.

Main Issue

3. The main issue in this case is the effect of the proposed development on the character and appearance of the area.

Reasons

4. The appeal site is prominently located on a bend on Maybank Avenue and comprises a two-storey end-of-terrace dwelling externally finished in painted render under a plain tiled roof. Previous alterations to the property include a box dormer and single-storey flat roofed extension to the rear. There is also a hip-to-gable addition to the side of the dwelling which was erected as 'permitted development'. A detached garage would be demolished to accommodate the proposal.
5. Established housing in the vicinity of the site is characterised by two-storey, semi-detached and terraced dwellings of varying age, scale and design. Many have been altered and extended in a range of styles and sizes consistent with their function as family housing.

¹ London Borough of Brent Unitary Development Plan (2004)(UDP)

² London Borough of Brent Local Plan: Development Management Policies (2016)

6. The proposed two-storey extension would be narrower than the existing dwelling and would be set back from the front elevation and feature a lower ridge line. In these respects it would comply with SPG5: *Altering and Extending Your Home* (2002) ('the SPG') which requires two-storey side extensions to be visually subordinate to the host dwelling.
7. The SPG does not normally permit the conversion of a hipped roof to a full gable as it would result in a significant change to the character and appearance of the dwelling and the streetscene. It adds that where a house already has a conversion from a hipped roof to a full gable end (as in this case), permission will not be granted for a side extension to the property.
8. This would be a sizeable addition to a house that has already been altered and extended quite significantly. It would dominate the dwelling and result in an over-development of this prominent site. Moreover, the extension would perpetuate the unbalanced appearance of the terrace which has resulted from the hip-to-gable extension to the appeal property and is at odds with the hipped roof to the extended dwelling at the opposite end.
9. I reaching these findings, I have taken into account extensions to other dwellings in the locality referred to by the appellant. However, those at Nos 134, 135 and 145 Maybank Avenue feature hipped roofs consistent with the SPG and, in the case of 135 and 145, are on far more generous plots. The development at No 133 appears to be a new build or a substantially altered dwelling that is not comparable to the appeal proposal.
10. I therefore conclude that the proposed extension would unacceptably harm the character and appearance of the area in conflict with that part of Policy DMP1 of the Local Plan which requires development to complement the locality in terms of scale and design.

Conclusion

11. For the reasons set out above, I conclude that the proposal is unacceptable and the appeal should fail.

Michael Moffoot

Inspector